



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

1

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/502,014	07/20/2004	Tsukasa Aga	Q82625	8458
23373	7590	11/15/2006	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			CHEUNG, WILLIAM K	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1713	

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/502,014	AGA, TSUKASA
Examiner	Art Unit	
William K. Cheung	1713	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1. The request filed on October 11, 2006 for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 10/502,014 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows. The amendment filed October 11, 2006 has been entered. The amendment for claim 1, "three or more side chains" is supported by applicants' specification (page 6, line 28-29). Claims 1-10 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Oharu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,610,775) for the reasons adequately set forth from the office action of October 21, 2005.

Applicant's arguments filed October 11, 2006, August 3, 2006, March 20, 2006, and February 21, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the amended claim 1 has overcome the rejection set forth. However, applicants fail to recognize that since Oharu et al. (col. 9, line 42-61) explicitly disclose that R^{10} (mistyped as R^2) can represent an alkyl having a carbon number of 8 or more and R^{10} , may be of a branched structure (col. 9, line 53-54). Because the structure (Formula 5) of Oharu et al. clearly disclose R^{10} having 8 or more carbons that are branched which generically includes numerous species of structures having three or

more side chains, the examiner has a reasonable basis to believe that the claimed R¹ (three or more side chains) of formula (I) is inherently possessed in Oharu et al. because the side chains are already inherently possessed in the alkyl group.

Further, even assuming that Oharu et al. do not disclose structures that generically include the “three or more side chains” as claimed, motivated by the expectation of success that the surfactant (Formula 5) of Oharu et al. are effective surfactants for the formulations of a water dispersion capable of imparting excellent heavy rain durability to an object to be treated (col. 1, line 5-17), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in art to incorporate the branched alkyl teachings of Oharu et al. into the structure (I) of claim 1 to obtain the invention of claims 1-10, as one of ordinary skill in art would have recognized and appreciated all the branched species as taught by Oharu et al. (col. 9, line 53-54).

Regarding applicants’ argument on “alkpolyenyl”, applicants fail to recognize that the amendment filed October 11, 2006 do not recite such feature.

Regarding applicants’ argument that the specification (Page 17, Table B) contain the criticality of the claimed “alkyl” chains having three or more side chains in high level of water and oil repellency, applicants must recognize that such argument is not sufficient to overcome the 102 portion of the 102-3 rejection set forth.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William K. Cheung whose telephone number is (571) 272-1097. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM to 2:00PM; 4:00PM to 8:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David WU can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



William K. Cheung

Primary Examiner

November 9, 2006

WILLIAM K. CHEUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER